

House and Senate read this piece, and consider the value and benefit that the B-2 offers our national defense.

[From Forbes magazine, Nov. 6, 1995]

KEEP THE B-2 PROGRAM ALIVE

(By Caspar Weinberger)

Whether to continue production of the B-2 stealth bomber, the world's most advanced aircraft, is an issue that creates strange alliances. Many proponents of a strong defense favor terminating the B-2 program, leaving us with only the 20 aircraft already paid for. A second group favor making the required expenditures now (roughly \$500 million) that would enable us to resume production of the B-2 should international conditions require it. This would be far less expensive than closing the production line and having to start it up later. A third group, small in number, believe we need more B-2s and should continue production on a low-level scale.

The second group's approach is the most reasonable, practical and necessary. The B-2—the world's only stealth bomber—is, as even one of its strongest opponents admits, "a technological marvel . . . widely praised by our highest-ranking military leaders." But few people seem to understand just how good, how revolutionary, this stealth bomber is and what it adds to our ability to keep peace and freedom.

Of course, the word "stealth" does not mean the plane is invisible. But when the B-2 is at high altitudes, where it flies when delivering nuclear or conventional bombs, it is virtually impossible for any existing or projected defense system to detect it on radar, and it therefore is invulnerable. Two B-2s with a total crew of four can deliver a bombload which, if dropped from conventional planes, would put the lives of 132 crewmen at risk. In the Gulf war's first hours, 45 sorties by stealth fighter F-117s struck almost as many Iraqi targets as did 850 sorties by conventional aircraft. In the first 24 hours of Desert Storm, we sent 1,263 conventional aircraft to strike 144 major targets. Thirty-two B-2s could have attacked the same number of targets—and more effectively because of precision weaponry—in less time.

The debate turns on whether we need this astonishing capability now that the Cold War is over. Senator John McCain (R-Ariz.), a skilled and effective advocate of a strong defense, believes that we no longer need a "large fleet of stealthy, long-range, nuclear delivery aircraft." He also views aircraft carriers, submarines and other weapons as better serving our national security needs because they are "visible, forward-deployed forces," enabling us to "put our capability on peaceful display"—a good deterrent in and of itself. McCain makes the point that, although the B-2 can carry conventional weapons, having it do so is not cost-effective at a fixed price of \$556 million per aircraft. Each additional B-2 will use scarce defense budget funds, precluding necessary modernization and replacements for the trucks, tanks, other aircraft, artillery and ships that will be needed shortly. These are understandable, reasonable arguments.

It seems to me, however, that events over the last several years have demonstrated conclusively that we are going to need the B-2's capabilities. The Gulf war exemplifies why we need to be able to project our military power over vast distances quickly and effectively. It would be nice—but scarcely safe—to believe that there will be no more Gulf wars or events that will require such capabilities. But, for example, we are committed to the defense of two other potential hotspots: Taiwan and South Korea. Should the U.S. be called into action, the B-2 would be extremely useful. It serves us well to re-

member that the more strength we have, the less likely it is that we will have to use it.

In any event, the ultimate question of whether we need to buy more than the already-ordered B-2s need not be decided now. What we do need now is the option to acquire more later and the ability to exercise that option without the staggering costs of re-starting production. If we terminate the B-2 production line now, we virtually preclude securing any more of those remarkable aircraft in the future.

We should instead agree to use the funds in the Defense appropriations bill to procure some of the parts necessary from the B-2's nearly 3,400 suppliers, thereby keeping the line open for later low-level production. General John Loh, former commander of our Air Combat Command, sums it up well: "I see the B-2 as the centerpiece of . . . [a] strategy that places increasing importance on projecting immediate, responsive power from the U.S. to a regional crisis anywhere in the world."

INTRODUCTION OF THE STATE  
WATER SOVEREIGNTY PROTECTION ACT

HON. MICHAEL D. CRAPO

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1995

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce a bill to preserve the authority of the States over waters within their boundaries, to delegate the authority of the Congress to the States to regulate water, and for other purposes.

Since 1866, Congress has recognized and deferred to the authority of the States to allocate and administer water within their borders. The Supreme Court has confirmed that this is an appropriate role for the States. Additionally, in 1952 the Congress passed the McCarran amendment which provides for the adjudication of State and Federal water claims in State water courts.

However, despite both judicial and legislative edicts, I am deeply concerned that the administration, Federal agencies and some in Congress are setting the stage for ignoring long established statutory provisions concerning State water rights and State water contracts. The Endangered Species Act, the Clean Water Act, the Federal Land Management Policy Act, Endangered Species Act Recovery Plans, rangeland reform, and proposed wilderness legislation have been vehicles used to erode State sovereignty over its water.

It is imperative that States maintain sovereignty over management and control of their water and river systems. All rights to water or reservations of rights for any purpose in States should be subject to the substantive and procedural laws of that State, not the Federal Government. To protect State water rights I am introducing the State Water Sovereignty Protection Act.

RECOGNITION OF JUDE  
HARRINGTON

HON. BUD SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 30, 1995

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, far too often the work of the men and women who are charged with preserving our Nation's natural resources goes unnoticed. These individuals, many of whom dedicate their lives toward maintaining America's treasures are rarely recognized for the importance of the service which they provide.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to such an individual from my own congressional district, Mr. Jude Harrington of Huntingdon, PA. A native of Pennsylvania, Mr. Harrington began his career with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1980 as a student intern with the Pittsburgh district. He received a bachelors degree in parks and recreation from Slippery Rock University in 1982. After graduating from Slippery Rock, Jude has served the corps at several different locations and in the process has earned a solid reputation as a man of integrity and conviction.

Since 1992, Jude has served as the supervisory ranger for Raystown Lake. His work at the lake has enabled it to become one of the largest tourist and recreation attractions in my district. In fact, last year 1.3 million people traveled to rural Pennsylvania to visit Raystown Lake. Mr. Harrington's primary responsibilities at Raystown are centered upon the management of the lake's natural resources and recreation programs.

Recently, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers selected Jude Harrington as the national resources management employee of the year. The corps handpicked Jude out of a field of a possible 1,200 candidates from across the Nation. They recognized what we in the Ninth District have known for years, that Jude Harrington is the best of the best when it comes to natural resources management. His work on behalf of Raystown Lake is a testament to both his love for the area and his commitment to the preservation of natural resources. I will close by thanking Jude Harrington for his service to Raystown Lake and congratulating him on being recognized for this honor which he richly deserves.

THE 7-YEAR BALANCED BUDGET  
RECONCILIATION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 26, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2491) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 105 of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996:

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Seven-Year Balanced Budget Reconciliation Act of 1995. As the name implies, this package of reforms outlines a clear path to a balanced budget in the year 2002. We promised the American people that